LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.

FILED
FEB 26 1970
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1969

Nos. 914, 915, 916, 917, 920, 921, 1038, 1057

THE NEW YORK, NEW HAVEN AND HARTFORD RAILROAD COMPANY FIRST MORTGAGE 4% BONDHOLDERS COMMITTEE, MANUFACTURERS HANOVER TRUST COMPANY, as Trustee of the First and Refunding Mortgage of the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company, and THE CHASE MANHATTAN BANK, N. A., as Trustee under the General Income Mortgage of the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company,

Appellants-Petitioners-Respondents,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION and PENN CENTRAL COMPANY,

Appellees-Respondents-Petitioners.

On Appeals from the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York and on Writs of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

BRIEF FOR THE NEW YORK, NEW HAVEN AND HARTFORD RAILROAD COMPANY FIRST MORTGAGE 4% BONDHOLDERS COMMITTEE, APPELLANT-PETITIONER-RESPONDENT

LESTER C. MIGDAL
LAWRENCE W. POLLACK
Attorneys for New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company First Mortgage 4% Bondholders Committee, Appellant-Petitioner-Respondent
598 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022

MIGDAL, LOW, TENNEY & GLASS
Of Counsel

February 26, 1970

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Opinions Below	3
Jurisdiction	5
Constitutional Provisions and Statutes Involved	6
Questions Presented	7
Statement	12
Summary of Argument	27
Argument	35
I Since the Commission deprived the New Haven of due process of law by subordinating its responsibility to find the value of the New Haven assets and the equivalent consideration as impartial judges to its administrative function of formulating national transportation policy, this Court should provide, or require the courts below to provide, the uninhibited judicial review called for by the extreme circumstances of this case	35
II The Commission's deduction from net liquidation value of $22.1 million, its failure to require full payment in the equivalent of cash for the New Haven assets and its failure to provide compensation for the erosion of the bondholders' security, violate the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution and are not fair and equitable	49
A. The "pricing considerations" of abandonment delay and bulk sale discount, introduced by the Commission in the Remand Report, were arbitrary deductions of $22.1 million from the New Haven's minimum constitutional liquidation value	57

PAGE

(1) The "abandonment delay" discount.... 67

(2) The "bulk sale" discount 86

B. The Courts, having properly determined that the Commission erred in concluding that payment of $83.1 million of the minimum price required by the Constitution was satisfied by the delivery of 950,000 shares of Penn Central common stock, erred in failing to require payment in securities having a cash value of $83.1 million 95

C. The Commission's failure to provide compensation for erosion of $70 million of bondholders' security for the public benfit, except for $5 million of loss contribution, is unfair, inequitable and unconstitutional 102

(1) The unconstitutionality of the $70 million compulsory erosion 102

(2) The failure to require Penn Central to assume New Haven losses after the Penn Central merger 109

(3) The failure to provide compensation for the New Haven's going concern value 114

III The Courts erred in sustaining the Commission's failure to require Penn Central to pay any consideration for the transfer to it of the New Haven's share of the income from the Grand Central Terminal real properties formerly utilized by the New Haven to pay for its share of the station expenses 118

PAGE

IV The Commission's computation of the discount of net liquidation proceeds to present value was arbitrary and capricious 131

V The Commission's valuation of the New Haven's Harlem River and Oak Point freight yards was arbitrary and capricious 140

VI The Commission violated the Fifth Amendment by requiring the transfer to Penn Central of non-operating property without the payment of any consideration for such transfer 152

Conclusion 154

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:

Armstrong v. United States, 364 U.S. 40 (1960) 114

Atlantic Coast Line R.R. v. St. Joe Paper Co., 179 F. 2d 538 (5th Cir. 1950), *cert. denied*, 339 U. S. 929 (1950) 46, 47

Baltimore & Ohio R.R. Co. v. Aberdeen & Rockfish R. Co., 393 U.S. 87 (1968) 150

Baltimore & Ohio R. Co. v. United States, 386 U.S. 372 (1967) 13, 37

Boom Co. v. Patterson, 98 U.S. 403 (1878) 151, 152

Brooks-Scanlon Co. v. Railroad Commission, 251 U.S. 296 (1920) 51, 52, 53, 54, 65, 66, 72

Bullock v. Railroad Commission, 254 U.S. 513 (1921) .. 51

Burlington Truck Lines v. United States Lines, 371 U.S. 156 (1962) 75, 151